



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

been improved had the editor noted, first, that Horace is fond of metaphor as against simile and, secondly, that here we have a metaphor followed by a simile, as in *Epod.* 1. 33-34. Cf. *fortissima Tyndaridarum* (1. 1. 100), *rusticus expectat* (*Epp.* 1. 2. 42). To speak of *ut* as omitted before *Naevius* (Heinze, Palmer) is to spoil a fine practice of Horace. The note on *ut avarus* (1. 1. 108) might have profited from an examination of my discussion of this verse in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XVIII, 332-34; Heinze still regards *ut avarus* as = *utpote avarus*. He is right in reading *qui nemo*, but he is wrong, I think, in saying that Horace, not being a psychological investigator, will not trouble himself to give an answer to his question here. He does give the answer; he drifts into the answer imperceptibly in 110 ff., to state it more clearly in 113 ff. (I am glad to see that Heinze here disregards the discussion of this passage by Professor Postgate in *Classical Review* XV, 302-3).

On many other points I have comments I should like to make. What lover of Horace has not? *Sed ohe iam satis est*; I would not be accounted a Crispinus. The matters discussed above belong to the realm of the subjective; if I am right, they are *egregio inspersi corpore naevi*.

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1911. \$3.

After a lapse of seven years Mr. Platner's useful manual appears in a new edition. The enlargement is fortunately not great. The first edition had 514 pages; the second has 538, the typographical scheme remaining unchanged. A comparison of the two issues reveals a very large number of small improvements in phraseology and corrections of erroneous or unprecise statements, besides the to-be-expected changes due to the advancement of investigation since the first edition was published. The author appears to have kept track of all publications in the field during this interval, and to have made them available for his purposes by proper intellectual digestion. The mass of footnotes that make the book particularly valuable for purposes of study has been considerably enriched. Naturally enough the unadorned style that made the work appear a somewhat labored effort in the first instance has not vanished. Perhaps it were a counsel of perfection to utter even a longing for such a consummation. The apiarian virtues of industry and precision are perhaps after all the crowning virtues for such a work. Mr. Platner in his discussion of the early days of Rome still clings with puritan stubbornness to his earlier espoused Richterian doctrines. The present reviewer, in his less rigid regard for his *mumpsimus*, must be permitted to lament that his friend still labors to swallow the camel of belief in a

lineal Palatium-Septimontium-Quadripartite-Servian development, still professes faith (why?) in the prodigiously inconsistent notion that the original Servian wall ran outside of the Aventine, while the Servian *pomerium* ran inside of the hill, and still finds the exclusion of the Aventine from the *pomerium* until the reign of Claudius an unsolved mystery. Well, the book is in the reviewer's judgment a very good book after all, and he consoles himself with the thought that there is little enough unreasoned faith to be found on this present earth of ours.

E. T. M.

XII Panegyrici Latini post Aemilium Baehrensium iterum recensuit
 GUIELMUS BAEHRENS. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911.

Emil Baehrens in his edition of the *Latin Panegyrists* published in 1874, and in his *Rheinisches Museum* article, effected a distinct and welcome advance in our knowledge of the text. It has been reserved for his son after these many years to accomplish the pious task of supplementing and carrying on still further the elder man's work in this direction. Wilhelm Baehrens laid the foundation of his new recension of the *Panegyrici* in his Groningen Doctor's dissertation of last year (*Panegyricorum Latinorum editionis nouae praefatio maior. Accedit Plinii Panegyricus exemplar editionis*), in which among other things he emphasizes the high value of the Harleian codex as well as that of Upsala for the reconstitution of the lost archetype. He also dealt with the application of the at present extremely popular, newly revived "science" of *clausulae* to the text of the *Panegyrists*. These studies have now issued in the new edition of his father's book. A critical estimate of the work is forbidden in this place by exigencies of space. We can only express a general appreciative welcome, partly, to be sure, for the father's sake, but also because of the son's own merits.

But on the general question of the *clausulae*-passion the present writer must be pardoned for a feeling of something more than hesitation about its ultimate usefulness. Such investigation has appealed to many young scholars, partly no doubt because it offers a ready and simple means toward the composition of a "study." But the attempt to make a statistical science out of the matter would, I imagine, cause Cicero and Quintilian to smile. With what pain do we perceive that the ancients themselves do not consistently obey their own rules, or what we choose to exalt into the position of rules! And when it comes to such assurance as the proposition to amend an otherwise faultless text in the face of unanimous MS authority in order to make it conform to a postulated rule of *clausulae*, it is surely time to sound a retreat. I have often thought that a little mathematical study of permutations and probabilities, and the application thereof to the Latin tongue, might considerably calm the present-day enthusiasm of some of our "investigators."

E. T. M.